

EMANCIPATION—WHITE AND BLACK.

By ^{Samuel} S. S. NICHOLAS.

No. I.

THE amendments of the Constitution pending in Congress indicate a settled purpose to readjust the great fundamental compromises of the Federal Government. Whilst this is being done with a seemingly exclusive view to alleged justice to our black population, it is thought that justice to our white citizens should not be overlooked in the readjustment of the basis of our Union.

Whether from superior sagacity or from closer attention to her own interests, New England had the original compromises all her own way. For the sake of her then profit in the African slave trade, and the prospective benefit from the protection of her shipping against foreign competition, she sold to the extreme South a twenty year's continuance of the slave trade. Her States being small in territory, and with neither soil nor climate suited to a large population, she succeeded in obtaining for every State an equal voice in the most important department of the government. Availing herself of the anxiety of the larger States to perfect the Union, she compelled them to agree that her smallest State should always have a vote in the Senate equal to that of the largest and most populous. Hence little Rhode Island has a vote or political power equal to great New York or Pennsylvania. Hence citizens residing east of the Hudson have each a political power or influence six times greater than those residing immediately west of that river.

The great ethical principle which, in a representative republic requires the distribution of political power in proportion to population, was thus made to yield to her peculiar interests under the pretext that such a *quasi* State veto was indispensable to the preservation of the reserved or withheld rights and powers of the separate States, including the control of all local State institutions, the regulation of private property, and the defining for itself of the political status of the population of each separate State.

With admirable forecast and sagacity, New England took the precaution to restrict the nation in even its power of constitutional amendment, by making it a permanent irrevocable feature of the Constitution, that each State should always have an equal vote in the Senate. To this end, the Constitution says that by no amendment shall a "*State, without its consent, be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.*"

Let it be remembered: 1. That by reason of the selfish, mercenary greed of New England in keeping open the slave trade we are now suffering fully one-third the infliction caused by our negro population. 2. That by reason of the protection afforded by discriminating duties to her shipping and her manufacturers, she has had the comparative monopoly of the richest, most bountiful market in the world, until she has grown insolently rich, even to repletion. 3. That by her dexterity she obtained and many long years has enjoyed a bounty paid by the Federal Government on her cod fish, and still con-

tinues to enjoy that bounty, whilst buying the salt with which she cures her fish in the British Provinces, without paying any duty therefor to our government. 4. That by her gross disloyalty during the last war with England, and by recklessly driving forward with precipitate greed her selfish policy of a protective tariff, she brought the nation to the verge of civil war during the time of President Jackson, and first caused at the South sectional alienation and unfriendly feeling toward the Union. 5. That by her ceaseless agitation of the slave question, with her persistent efforts at interference with a subject over which she had no constitutional right of control, coupled with her blasphemous denunciations of the Constitution and the Union, she has been mainly instrumental in inflicting upon the nation the terrible disaster under which we are now suffering. 6. That after wantonly provoking the South into hating and despising her, she is now seeking to wield the whole power of the nation to punish that hate and contempt by Southern extermination, or by preventing a restoration of the Union, under the pretext of fanatical zeal in behalf of human freedom, whilst all indulgence of such fanatic zeal, hate, and vengeance is in direct violation of her duties under the Constitution. 7. That conscious of her inability legally to inflict upon the South, in any other way, the ruin of immediate, uncompensated emancipation, she now seeks its accomplishment by an amendment of the Constitution.

To accomplish this purpose New England has to uproot the great fundamental compromise which is the very basis of the whole Federal structure; that exemption of State institutions from Federal control, whose inviolable sanctity was the very object of that equal vote in the Senate, which the Constitution irrepealably guaranteed to her small States. For reforming the Constitution justice is her pretext—justice to her “black fellow-citizens.” Let her be put to the test; let her be made to show that justice, not malice or vengeance, is her real motive; let her be made to yield a part of that unjust advantage in the distribution of political power which she selfishly, so unconscionably extorted from her sister States in the original adjustment. Whilst in the frantic pursuit of her vengeance let her be so far checked as to be told that she cannot be indulged in such an amendment of the Constitution, unless her small States shall at the same time “consent” to being deprived of their “equal suffrage in the Senate.” That equal suffrage is such a gross violation of every principle of justice and of the plain, indisputable, natural right of her white fellow-citizens in the rest of the Union, that she cannot refuse if justice be her real object. Then let the two propositions go hand in hand—*inseparably welded together*—the abolition of negro slavery and the abolition of the equal suffrage in the Senate.

But that she may have no seeming just cause of complaint, and by way of contrast with her own conduct, let the Constitution be so amended that if she prefers she may be permitted to secede from the Union. What she will concede being nothing more than what pure right and justice require, she cannot refuse that price for the indulgence of her hate and vengeance.

No. II.

New England is just now characteristically employed. Knowing that she cannot effect the abolitionising of the Constitution by straightforward, fair dealing, she is seeking to accomplish her object by a *swindle*. She has procured acts of Congress for the conversion of three Territories into new States. Neither of these Territories has half enough population to entitle it, in justice, to be admitted as a State, or any local interest requiring a premature admission. The only assignable reason or motive for the trick, is to obtain State votes enough to accomplish the proposed constitution amendment. When the great, and what should be the sacred trust for admitting new States with an

exclusive view to justice to the people of Territories is thus perverted for a sinister party purpose in obtaining power, it must be pronounced a political swindle by every one having proper moral organization. But even these three States not being enough, the deficiency in making up the three-fourths of the States is to be supplied by the "rottenborough" rebel States, who are to be placed under the control of one-tenth of their voters, or, rather, of that refuse of their population, who, with Shoddyite camp-followers, will equal in number one-tenth of their voters.

Kentucky owns about a hundred millions worth of slave property. Missouri and Maryland together own about as much more. This two hundred millions of property was acquired with the full sanction of law and constitution. Its protection like that of all other property was a leading motive for forming the Union and adopting the Constitution. To pervert any of the national power from the protection to the destruction of such a vast amount of property, in the hands of loyal, unoffending owners, is a shameful swindle, equal in turpitude to an open, plain robbery. It is both a robbery and a swindle.

When England determined to abolish her negro slavery, it was agreed on all hands, even by her ultra fanatics, that justice required the compensation of the slave owners. So also it was decided by Congress when abolitionizing the District of Columbia. So also it was decided and held by President Lincoln up to the time when he recommended his scheme of "compensated emancipation" to the Border State delegations. It being suggested by some one during the conference that Congress would not make the compensation, he made his memorable response: "If so, then that knocks the bottom out of the tub," that is, out of his scheme. On that occasion he also emphatically declared, that a man who invested a thousand dollars in slave property had as indefeasible a right thereto as he would have had to land bought with the same money. Having reiterated his pledge to protect slave property whilst he remained President, and a gentleman present saying something which he understood as implying that he might forget his pledge, he indignantly responded with the question: "Do you see any of the snake in me?" So right-minded men must view everywhere and always view such a depriving owners of their property; it can only be viewed as gross robbery or shameful swindling. As said by the Supreme Court: "*The fundamental maxims of a free government seem to require that the rights of personal liberty and private property should be held sacred.*"

What has Kentucky done that she should be made the victim of such a robbery? What is her fault that she should be so enormously punished? What has New England to allege against her? It is an old grudge of fifty years standing. Kentucky, with her ever-living patriotism, went heartily into the last war with England for the violation of "free trade and sailor's rights," though she had not a sailor or a plank on the ocean, and earned, by her patriotic gallantry, a distinguished national applause. Not so New England, though the war was waged for the protection of her peculiar rights and interests; yet not seeing any immediate pecuniary advantage to her from its prosecution, she hung back with a treasonable apathy, giving it no aid whatever the nation being still young and feeble and needing the active support of every citizen in the perilous contest. On the contrary, when the peace in Europe enabled England to direct the whole of her immense military strength against our country, and its affairs wore the gloomiest possible aspect, New England availed herself of the occasion to concoct her notorious scheme of secession, which she certainly would have carried out had not peace intervened in the midst of her treasonable machination. Her people earned for themselves that stigma of enduring infamy, the cognomen of *blue light Yankees*. They did not even forbear from public exultation over that great national dishonor, the vandal sacking and

burning of Washington. In the expression of a proper contempt, if not detestation for this conduct, Kentucky took the lead among her sisters of the West. For this contempt New England will never forgive her. Kentucky long strove to hide those misdeeds in the oblivion of a willing forgetfulness. Whilst New England kept herself under the guidance of her real statesmen, her truly national men, Kentucky extended to her the hand of a cordial brotherhood, encouraging her in her supposed effort to live down her past errors by a regenerated life, and standing by her in her contest about the tariff. Not so with her. She is furnishing new proof of the truth of the old apothegm, that contempt is the unforgivable human offence. The attempted infliction of this swindling robbery upon Kentucky is but a taste of her undiluted venom. Believing as she does that slavery is dead in Dixie under Presidential proclamations and Congressional legislation, and will be crushed past restoration by the operations of the war, and whilst she vaunts its immediate abolition by the people of Missouri and Maryland, by reason of the military manipulation of the elections of those States, why, under the circumstances, does she, in the absence of all rational motive, press an amendment of the constitution which will have no practical bearing any where but in Kentucky? There is no mistaking her aim. It is a special arrow, barbed by Yankee hate, for Yankee vengeance, and pointed by Yankee cunning, with "Kentucky" for its label. It is a gage of political battle *a l'outrance* thrown at Kentucky. Such a challenge Kentucky never yet and never will decline. Her every loyal son will back her with the loud acclaim—*let God defend the right*. It is true her wrath against Kentucky does not assume so direful a hue as that which she exhibits against the rebel States, seeking, as she does, the extirpation of their property and white population. But then their offence has been more recent and aggravating. Over and beyond the Kentucky manifestation of contempt, those States have retaliated her officious intermeddling with slavery by giving her with an imputed world-renowned reputation for being the most illustrious among nations as a breeder of sharpers and swindlers. With such greater cause for hate against those States she appropriately places herself under the guidance of her dastard Senator, who had not the manhood to avenge his own personal wrongs, but is now seeking to wield the power of the nation to obtain for her and for himself a Satanic vengeance. Nothing short of the extermination of the rebel States will appease them.

In a private conversation with the lamented Crittenden, not ten days before his death, he was asked whether the abolition party had not been false and treacherous toward Kentucky. His reply was: "Yes; most ungrateful, also. If it could have been known beforehand, the policy upon which the war has been conducted, nothing could have prevented Kentucky from uniting early in secession. If so, she would have carried Missouri, Maryland, and Western Virginia with her, and in that event the administration would not have made even an effort to subjugate the South, nor would the people of the Northwest have volunteered to subjugate Kentucky. The Union would have been gone and gone forever." To prove the correctness of his opinion, and that he made no over-estimate of the value of the service rendered by Kentucky toward preserving the Union, it needs only to cite the following extract from the letter of Secretary Seward to Minister Adams, dated April 10, 1861: "For these reasons the President would not be disposed to reject a cardinal dogma of theirs, namely: that the Federal Government could not reduce the seceding States to obedience by conquest, even though he were disposed to question that proposition. But, in fact, the President willingly accepts it as true. Only an imperial Government could subjugate thoroughly disaffected and insurrectionary members of the State. This Federal republican system of ours is, of all forms of government, the very one which is most unfitted for such a labor."—"Keeping that remedy (a national convention)

steadily in view, the President on the one hand will not suffer the Federal authority to fall into abeyance, nor will he, on the other, aggravate existing evils by attempts at coercion which must assume the form of direct war against any of the revolutionary States." After reading this let any man suppose Kentucky to have joined the South, and then decide what would have been the probable fate of the Union.

If New England refuses, as she probably will, her consent to do justice and right toward her white fellow-citizens of other sections, by yielding a fair representation in the Senate in some proper proportion to population, then the balance of the nation must look to righting themselves without that consent. The way to this is plain, open, and easy. Two-thirds of the States can call a National Convention. When so assembled that number of States can (with the popular ratification of a majority of the nation) rightfully remodel the Union or Constitution to suit the demands of equal justice; provided the non-concurring States are permitted to remain out of the new Union if they so elect. There need be no apprehension that New England will make any such election. She has feathered her nest too well, ever willingly to quit the Union. If she patiently, pusillanimously suffered the robbing, kicking, and cuffing of England for long years, because she could make more money by submission than she could by resistance, she may be relied upon to make the most piteous supplications to remain in the Union, at the price of even much greater sacrifice of political power. To obtain the righting of this wrong, this gross inequality of representation in the Senate, there is needed, on the part of a majority of the nation, only a small portion of that perseverance which has enabled New England to inflict this dreadful civil war on our country.

The inexcusable folly, not to say wickedness, of the amendment of the Constitution, which the Shoddyite Destructives are trying to effect, is apparent from the fact that it will effectually preclude voluntary peaceable restoration and risk everything on the chances of battle. Every patriot is longing for the fulfilment of President Lincoln's prophecy, when both sides would get tired of fighting and mutually seek reconciliation. The adoption of this amendment will prevent the advent of any such day, because it will take from the government all power to offer terms of adjustment which the rebels can accept. Nothing will be left to the instructive and conciliating influences of time and disaster, but everything will be referred to the impulse of despair and the uncertain arbitrament of the sword.

No. III.

Since sending to the press the previous numbers, the writer has read the speech of a New England Senator, urging the adoption of this scheme for swindling Kentucky by an amendment of the Constitution, in which he avows that the principal practical effect of the swindle will be in its operation upon Kentucky, thus verifying the imputation herein, that such was its main object. In justification of the scheme he uses the following language in reference to Kentucky:

"Halting in her patriotism, limping in her support of the Government, divided betwixt her love for the Union and her love for slavery, preferring to sacrifice her white sons to subdue rebellion rather than put her slaves in the army, she is a most melancholy spectacle, showing to the world how this accursed weight (slavery) could drag down the gallant old State, how it could benumb its energies, paralyze its efforts, divide and arm its citizens against themselves." * * * "How cravenly and unpatriotically did the gallant Kentuckians mount the platform of neutrality and leave the old flag to be borne and upheld by other hands!"

Kentuckians will ponder this reviling of their loved mother, of whom they

are so proud. The writer will not be censured whilst lifting in her behalf the gage of battle hurled by New England for the strong retaliatory terms in which he has portrayed the unworthiness of the challenger. Those who know how Kentucky won her proud reputation for gallantry and for chivalrie, unselfish patriotism, need not be told the contemptuous scorn with which her sons will receive this insolent denunciation of her in the Senate Chamber. A blue-light Yankee to denounce Kentucky for want of courage and patriotism! Does this miserable shoddyite hope it is forgotten that during the last war with England, when Kentucky had a white population of only some three hundred and fifty thousand, she lost more volunteers in battle than all New England sent into the field during the whole war? Whilst Kentucky volunteers were repelling British invasion, and protecting New Englanders, settled on the frontiers of Ohio and Indiana, from the tomahawk and scalping-knife, their Yankee kindred were skulking from the conflict, remaining at home in ignominious safety, hatching foul treason against their country, scheming to accomplish the secession of New England, when the then feeble nation was in the midst of a perilous war with the greatest military power of the world, and earning for themselves that enduring stigma of national infliction, their *soubriquet* of blue-light Yankees. It is not yet forgotten that during the terrible conflict New England lent the nation no helping hand, did not give even the cheering of a friendly voice, but, under the bidding of her legislative halls and her pulpits, refused to rejoice over the nation's victories under the hypocritical pretence that such exultation was "unbecoming a moral and religious people," and, under the penalty of social ostracism, she rigorously interdicted all aid to the government from even the idle capital of her citizens. Now, again, when the nation is encountering another great peril, when the question of its civil liberty is trembling in the balance, she shows her destitution of all moral obligation of obedience to the great national compact; she acknowledges allegiance to nothing but her own "higher law"—that is, the law that suits her present purpose; she is treacherously and traitorously lending her aid toward the destruction of the Constitution and the erection of a despotism on the ruins of American liberty; she sends her sanctimonious sons to the capital to make a solemn oath to support the Constitution, and encourages them in immediately turning round and spitting upon it and trampling it under foot. One of her sons, the other day, had the infamising frankness to make the following avowal in the Senate: "So far as I am concerned, I shall not stop to inquire whether the employment of slaves as soldiers is constitutional or unconstitutional—whether it be legal or illegal."

Though New England has proved herself a recreant in war, a commercial trickster in peace, and a faithless party to the great national compact, she has the imprudent assurance to attempt to assume over her sisters the pharisaical character of a moral censor. Has she no fear of being reminded of her blue laws, her burning of witches, her whipping, branding, and perhaps hanging Quaker men and women, with her persecution and banishment of Baptists? Even in regard to the present great moral touchstone, the question of negro slavery, has she no fear of her antecedents, of being reminded of the poor Indians she reduced to slavery and sold in the West Indies in exchange for negro slaves; of the numerous negro slaves she held in bondage so long as their labor was deemed profitable to her, and most of whom she sold to the South, in preparation for the cessation of slavery as one of her cherished institutions. This precious Senator of hers, in further justification of the attempted robbery of Kentucky, says: "The dire calamities now befalling us are retributions of Providence upon a stupendous crime," that is, the crime of negro slavery. Now there are grades of this crime wide apart. They rise from the simple holding of slaves by purchase or inheritance, under the sanction of law and the approving example of every nation, christian or

heathen, ancient or modern, up to that crime of crimes, the African slave trade, which stands condemned by the consent of all Christendom, or among the greatest of human atrocities. The Declaration of Independence denounced it as an infamous traffic, and so soon as the nation could exercise its will untrammelled by the restraint which New England aided in putting into the Constitution, it was with great unanimity denounced as piracy by Congress and its participants condemned to felon deaths under the gallows. Now this very traffic New England followed extensively, and made more profit from, many times over, than all the balance of the nation. The direful horrors of the middle passage did not touch her conscience so long as she could make money by the traffic. Many of her citizens still kept it up between Africa and the West Indies long after its interdiction by Congress. One of those citizens, who was notorious for having amassed a large fortune in the trade, was sent by her to the U. S. Senate, where he remained for years, though the reception he met with from Southern and Western Senators sufficiently indicated that they considered his presence as a pollution. What and when have been the "retributions of Providence" upon New England for her larger share of the worst part of this "most stupendous crime?" Has it been shown in the drying up of her courage and of all those generous, self-denying, self-sacrificing feelings which are necessary to patriotism, and reducing her to that unenviable, unlovable thing—all brain and no heart. No other retribution is now being inflicted on her. In the calm security of her local position, removed from all perils of the war, so far from feeling that she is suffering any sort of flagellation, she is hugging herself, with exulting self-gratulation, in the enjoyment of her shoddy beatitude. Whilst the South is suffering even to the extent of utter ruin, is she to suffer no retribution for her equal share in the crime of bringing on this civil war. This, her responsibility for a full share of the crime, she wishes with blasphemous hypocrisy to shift from herself over upon Providence. This, too, though repeatedly warned and rewarned during the last thirty years by patriot statesman, her own Webster included, that her officious exasperating intermeddling with the subject of slavery, would inevitably cause civil war. And this, too, despite the boastful avowals of her leaders, that they had been diligently seeking disunion for more than twenty years, and habitually denouncing the Constitution as a covenant with death and a league with hell. To leave her unpunished can not be the award of a just Providence.

An amendment of the Constitution, by which to rob Kentucky of a hundred million worth of property, is the New England prescription, which this, her precious Senator insists, will regenerate Kentucky, and restore her to her former gallantry and patriotism. Why not first try the prescription upon New England herself? She was once brave and patriotic. That was when she was poor. Has her accumulation of wealth been the cause of her present pitiable condition of moral degradation? Then try her remedy—rob her by a constitutional amendment to the sum of three or four hundred million. Her whole history, for more than half a century, proves that the only nerves which reach her moral censorium are those which pass through her pocket. If the remedy can be efficacious anywhere, it will be with her pre-eminently money-loving people.

This her precious Senator accuses Kentucky of "halting between her love for the Union and her love for slavery"—that is, for her property. Now New England never made any such halt in her patriotism; she never paused between her love of country and her love of self. After England had lawlessly pillaged her commerce and impressed her seamen for years, and the rest of the nation could stand it no longer but went to war to redress the national honor, she said no; this war is a thing that will not pay; we can make more money by submission than by resistance; New England will not help—

and she did not help. She has borne the penalty of ever since standing, in national estimation as a section, more concerned for the pockets of its own people than for the national honor, and as a selfish, unloving, unlovable, treacherous, traitorous sister in the confederacy of States. This has been the earthly retribution—the Providential she has yet to receive. If that retribution were in the hands of an avenging Nemesis, her radical destructives would be aided in accomplishing their avowed purpose of converting our National Government into a "Consolidated Democracy." In that event it would be within the chapter of probabilities that she would be robbed of some three or four hundred million of her redundant wealth. In that, her hour of agonized wail and distress, the remembrance of her merciful forbearance in this, the day of her power, will cause good men to rush to her rescue just as her *promised* volunteers have "swarmed the highways" to aid the war in all the ebullient exuberance of genuine Yankee patriotism.

The writer has no distinct recollection of ever having read a letter said to have been written by President Lincoln in the summer or fall of 1861, and since published, which he is assured by two intelligent gentlemen contained in substance the expression of the following opinion: We cannot afford to run the risk of losing Kentucky; for if we lose her, we might as well give up the war. Whether he so wrote or not, there is abundant evidence to prove that he so thought. This is strong corroboration of the estimate placed by Mr. Crittenden upon the great value of the adhesion of Kentucky to the Union toward its preservation. But now, though she repudiated the bad example of New England by attending more to the calls of patriotism than those of sectional sympathy and seeming local interests, thereby rendering a most inestimable service to the nation, she is reviled by this shoddyite Senator, because she will not patiently submit to being robbed for the alleged purpose of improving her patriotism—that is, improving her love for those who rob her. That it would be plain robbery, no just man can deny. That it will inflict a foul stigma on the national character the enlightened men of every civilized country will agree. They will class it with those unconscionable acts of tyranny, known as repudiations, arbitrary confiscations for no crime, the seizure of private property for public use or the purpose of a public policy without compensation, bills of attainder—*ex post facto* laws, and the rest of all the machinery with which legislative tyrants have wreaked vengeance upon their party opposers, and for which they have brought upon themselves the infamising condemnation of history.

New England, with three million population, has twelve votes in the Senate, which on principles of fairness would require that New York, with her four million, should have sixteen votes, whereas she has only two. This shows that New Englanders have eight times as much of this political power as is allowed to New Yorkers. The inequality as to the rest of the Union is in the same proportion. This gross injustice should cease. Whilst New England, for fanatic purposes and for the sake of vengeance, is so pertinaciously insisting upon the emancipation of the negroes, the nation should insist upon its own emancipation from this political thralldom. Justice, whether abstract or practical, demands the emancipation of the *whites* full as much as it does that of the blacks. *White emancipation* should at least accompany black emancipation.

No. IV.

The other day a Senator, who is among the ablest of those who seek the abolitionizing of the Constitution, said in debate: "There are but two sides to the question. The one is Union without slavery; the other the immediate unconditional acknowledgment of the Southern Confederacy." After

having shown, to his own satisfaction, the necessity for abolishing slavery in avoidance of future civil war, he proceeds to prove, if that could not be done, the necessity for his other alternative, as follows:

"Shall this war go on forever? Should the war go on until the public debt equals the entire wealth of the country? Should the whole capital of the people be forced into Federal securities, and these securities made the basis of an irredeemable paper circulation? Should it go on until misery broods over the whole land; until the civil authorities become impotent, and all rights of person and property stand at the mercy of military power? Should it go on until the members of the Senate and House of Representatives shall owe their places here to the bayonet instead of the ballot-box? Should it go on until corruption and fraud, the necessary concomitants of civil war, shall have crept into high places, put on the garb of patriotism, and give themselves the means of perpetuating their own power? Should it continue until the nation, exhausted, will welcome the coming of a Cromwell or a Bonaparte; until Provost Marshals shall be stationed with a military police at every village in the Northern States, displacing the civil authority, governing the people heretofore supposed capable of governing themselves; teaching how God shall be worshiped, prescribing new and strange offences, and punishing them by courts-martial? Should it continue until financial ruin brings misery, and misery rushes into anarchy when no hope but despotism is left?

"A few more years of civil war and this picture will be seen. It cannot be otherwise. It is the necessary result of a long civil strife. Peace parties will spring up; the war party will denounce them as traitors; the publication of newspapers will be suppressed and freedom of speech denied; mobs will retaliate; the blindness as well as the corruption of the war party will strengthen the convictions of the peace party; each party will appeal to violence, the one to hold, the other to obtain power; the ballot-box will become a mockery, a cheat; instead of proclaiming the voice of a free people it will speak the language of base subserviency or the bold tones of military despotism.

"Such is history. We are not exempt from the passions and frailties that wove this web of history for others. Party pride, blinded vanity, may think so. These have driven many nations from the enjoyment of liberty to the profoundest depths of tyranny. Party revenge may be gratified when political enemies come to grief, but that is no compensation for a ruined country. When anarchy comes we are overwhelmed alike. The Girondist and the Jacobin followed each other in rapid succession to the guillotine."

This is a gloomy picture which the Senator paints of the inevitable condition of our country if the war last only a few years longer. The painting, if verified in results, is only what was pictured for our warning by the fathers of the republic. But thinking as he does, having so clear a prevision of the calamities to ensue from the continuance of the war, it is incomprehensible why he does not devote all his energies toward its speedy termination, to removing instead of creating difficulties in the way of amicable adjustment. A mere perpetuation of slavery in the Union could not possibly produce any greater calamity than that. The uncertain evils of merely apprehended conjectured civil war in the future can be no justification for incurring such horrid immediate ruin, or one which is only to be postponed for two or three years. There would be no statemanship, no patriotism in that. Why not then leave all other policy for that which promises the speediest termination of the war without disunion? He is a man of far too much intelligence to suppose that abolitionizing the Constitution will have any such tendency. He may think it will tend to perpetuate peace when it is once conquered, but it can give no aid toward such conquest. Its every tendency is the other way. It can only serve to intensify despairing resistance at the South. It

not merely will rob her of full two-thirds in value of all her chattel property, but will thereby also destroy nine tenths of the value of all her real estate. Nor is this all. It will leave in her midst the canker-worm of a hostile race, with which her own people will be at perpetual feud, and causing, according to the inevitable principles of a natural, veritable "irrepressible conflict," the perpetual recurrence of intestine civil wars between the two races, until one or the other is exterminated. It is therefore the merest folly, as no one knows better than this intelligent Senator, to expect that anything short of utter subjugation, the direst necessity, will make the South submit to an abolitionized Constitution. Where then is the justification for this Senator, in pursuing a policy so obviously in conflict with his opinion as to the near and great danger to the country from a prolongation of the war? There is nothing even in disunion at all comparable in amount of national disaster to what he says we are bound to suffer after "a few years more of civil war." Why deprive ourselves of the chance that before the lapse of those few years, though we may fail wholly to subdue her, yet the South may become so tired of suffering and disaster as to seek conciliation on reasonable terms? Why close that door by this amendment of the Constitution? Why trust everything to the uncertain issue of battles? Why deprive ourselves of any chance toward the avoidance of such a tremendous peril?

To remove all future danger from the irrepressible conflict is the pretext. But by indicting such tremendous loss of property upon the South, we shall cause a much more dangerous conflict. That wrong would be one which the South would neither forget or forgive in the lapse of centuries. Her people would be to us what the Irish have been to England for two centuries; a powerful internal enemy ever ready to join any foreign enemy in the pursuit of vengeance. We should generate a greater in the avoidance of a lesser national danger.

In addition to all this, what is to compensate the loss of national honor in the perfidious, ungrateful robbery of Kentucky. To rob her of her slave property, for the purpose of a great national policy without compensating for what she holds under the sanction of law and Constitution, will be condemned by the on-looking world, and by history the same as robbery by *ex post facto* laws, bill of attainder, or any other mode of arbitrary confiscation. The condemnation will be none the less, because the wrong will be one of national infliction. A nation can commit crime as well as a legislature, and enjoys no exemption from the retribution to be found in the disparaging rebuke of civilized nations. But above all, what a short-sighted policy must that be which shall persecute near a million of Kentuckians into despising and hating their Government?

The Editor of the Democrat in his paper of Tuesday has given abundant proof of the conduct of New England during the last war with England; but if more is desired it can be found in Matthew Carey's Olive Branch, and in the recent speech of Senator Davis.

No. V.

The "irrepressible conflict" on negro slavery is assumed to be the cause of this disastrous, wicked rebellion, and of all the sectional alienation of national feeling by which it was preceded. This dogma has become a stereotyped phrase of the abolition press. The changes have been rung upon it so long and so continuously, for sinister purposes, that there is some danger of public opinion settling down into an acquiescence in its truth, false as it is. The Legislature of Tennessee in 1859, when unanimous in its Unionism, gave, in the following resolution, a sound and truthful solution of that sectional alienation with the consequent rebellion:

"*Resolved*, That in the opinion of this General Assembly all the evils growing out of the present intense slavery agitation—all the discord, alienation, and bitter hatred, now growing up and extending between the North and the South—are the legitimate fruit, not of any necessary and "irrepressible conflict" between free and slave labor, but of a conflict between rival aspirants in the race of ambition, North and South, urged on by an inordinate greed of official power and plunder—a conflict which can only be repressed by a powerful effort by the friends of the Union, to rouse the people to a conviction of the reality and magnitude of the impending dangers to its existence."

This is the true doctrine. It is sustained alike by the truth of history and the teaching of sound political science. For a century prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and for more than forty years thereafter, no such conflict was either felt or surmised. For fifty years of national existence the two systems of labor were carried on harmoniously together, with a development of national prosperity, whose rapidity and promising permanence were wholly unprecedented in the history of the world. A prosperity which was receiving continually increasing development during the thirty years preceding the rebellion, notwithstanding the unceasing efforts of politicians, North and South, for sinister party purposes, to cause such a conflict by the incessant agitation of the subject. It was an untruthful, unsound dogma when first uttered by its fire-eater inventor, and which could not, as it did not, receive acceptance among intelligent men, for long after it had obtained recognition and adoption from Messrs. Lincoln and Seward. Rational men of every section—true lovers of the Union—repudiated the dogma as *visibly* unsound and untrue, and for the obvious reason that whatever of more than mere semblance of truth there might be in it, yet in its despite the national prosperity had progressed with an all sufficient rapidity, *disproving* any need of change and proving that to be let alone was all that was needed for the fruition of a geometrically increasing national prosperity and an enduring national happiness.

After thus disproving the dogma, it will be proper to prove the soundness of the theory announced by the Tennessee Legislature; that is, that our present national calamity is due mainly, if not exclusively, to those conflicts of politicians in pursuit of office and power which have raged almost unintermittently since Washington's administration. Whilst the dogma is being made the pretext for unsettling the great foundation of the Federal Constitution and the adoption of an abolitionizing amendment, which will effectually destroy all hope of an amicable, an enduring, a beneficial restoration or reconstruction of the Union, the public mind should not merely be disabused as to the imputed necessity for such change, but pointed to the true source of the evil whilst in pursuit of a corrective.

That distinguished English writer, John Stuart Mill, who stands pre-eminent as the political philosopher of the age, in descending, some few years ago, upon the structure of the executive department of the Federal Government, expressed the following opinion: "Another important consideration is the great mischief of unintermitted electioneering. When the highest dignity in the State is to be conferred by popular election once in every few years, the whole intervening time is spent in what is virtually a canvass, and every public question is discussed and decided with less reference to its merits than to its expected bearing on the Presidential election. If a system had been devised to make party spirit the ruling principle of action in all public affairs, and create an inducement not only to make every question a party question, but to *raise questions* for the purpose of founding parties upon them, it would have been difficult to contrive any means better adapted to the purpose." His philosophical theorizing on our scheme of an elective Presidency is fully sustained by the practical observation and opinion of the Tennessee Legislature.

To the pernicious excess of partyism generated by contests for the Presidency is mainly attributable "all the discord, alienation, and bitter hatred between the North and the South" which have caused this calamitous rebellion. To that, therefore, and not to the irrepressible conflict dogma, should the national attention be directed, in any attempt to eradicate the cause, for the purpose of preventing the recurrence of such rebellions in the future. The dogma is a thing of comparatively modern invention for party purposes, whereas the seeds of sectional alienation and hatred had been sown and diligently cultivated for the sake of party success for more than fifty years. Party action caused the hatred, and the hatred was then played upon to refuse prejudice against negro slavery. The latter was not the motive, but only used as a means to gratify the former. New England, which figures so prominently and unanimously in favor of abolitionism, never bethought of the crime of negro slavery until long after the Missouri compromise controversy. Then her politicians said little or nothing about the alleged crime of slavery. Then the grave men relied upon by her was the inequality and proven injustice of the original compact giving the South representation for what ought to be considered as property and not as part of its population. So recently as the organization of the first free soil party by Van Buren, she lent the movement no aid, its leaders being anti-tariff Democrats, and she not seeing how its triumph would enure especially to her benefit, though gratifying her sectional animosity. It was not until the organization of the Republican party promised the gratification of this feeling, whilst at the same time enhancing her political power, that she cordially co-operated in a political movement having hostility to negro slavery for its avowed object. Her antecedents in reference to the African slave trade, and the sale of her own slaves to the South, were so notorious as to preclude her from undertaking single handed, or as the prominent leader any crusade against negro slavery, on exclusively overrighteous or moral grounds. She merely fomented and used Northern prejudice to obtain the power by which to "feed fat the ancient grudge" she bore the South, from hatred generated in contests for the Presidency.

What rational, practical observer of the influence of partyism upon poor, erring human nature, now and in the past, can doubt that the defeat of Jefferson, in the first contest for the Presidency, had very much to do with the extreme to which the State rights doctrine was carried by the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of '98 and '99? Who doubts that the exasperation of political defeats made the whole Federal party of the North unanimous against the Missouri compromise? Who doubts that the resentments of a common defeat, combined the friends of Jackson, Crawford, and Calhoun, otherwise so discordant, into a cordial opposition to the administration of J. Q. Adams? Who doubts that the defeat of the latter gentleman, operating upon an irascible, unforgiving temper, had much to do with his aid to the anti-slavery movement? Who doubts that political vengeance was the exclusive motive with the Van Burens for the organization of the first free soil party of any importance? Who doubts that the revenging of Democratic triumphs was the main cause for casting aside the old Whig party and seeking a party consolidation of the free States, under the free soil anti-slavery banner? But, above all, who doubts that avenging the defeat of the elder Adams, and his party followers, was the main cause of New England opposition to the acquisition of Louisiana, to the last war with England, and to all measures in support of that war, driving her people, in the midst of that war, to the very verge of the foul treason of secession?

The only answer to these queries point to the indisputable historic facts, which prove that the contests for the Presidency have been the principal cause of the sectional alienation and hatred, which has ultimately brought to its aid sectional prejudice on the slave question. There never was any semblance of

the irrepressible conflict, until parties, for party purposes, aroused and used that prejudice. The great fundamental fault in our governmental structure is, therefore, not where the dogma points, but is to be found in the mode of obtaining our Presidents through an untrammelled popular election. It is there the corrective must be applied, in seeking by constitutional amendment to eradicate the cause of the present national calamity and preventing its recurrence in the future.

In addition to other superabundant proof, we have the testimony of John Quincy Adams and Governor Plumer, of New Hampshire, as to the prevalence of the disunion sentiment among the leading politicians of New England for years before the last war with England. Mr. Adams, after saying that the New England projects for disunion culminated in and found their final catastrophe in the Hartford Convention, tells us: "The postulates of disunion were nearly consummated. The interposition of a kind Providence, restoring peace to our country and the world, averted the most deplorable catastrophe, and turning over to the receptical of things lost on earth the adjourned Convention from Hartford to Boston, extinguished *the projected New England Confederacy.*"

Josiah Quincy was probably the ablest representative that New England ever had in Congress, excepting Webster. He more distinctly and much more nearly represented New England sentiment than Webster ever did. During his speech made in 1811, opposing the admission of Louisiana as a State, he was called to order for the utterance of disloyal sentiments, when he reduced the following to writing, as what he had said and what he meant to abide by:

"I am compelled to declare it as my deliberate opinion, that if this bill passes the bonds of Union are virtually dissolved; that the States which compose it are free from moral obligations, and that as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, to prepare definitely for a separation—peaceably if they can, forcibly if they must."

It appears from a recent debate in the Senate that the twelve New England Senators have the chairmanship of *fourteen* committees, four of them being the most important, and wielding more power and influence than all the other committees combined. Of at least two of the other committees next in importance to those four, New Englanders are chairmen as Senators from Western States. Nothing could well exemplify better the necessity for curtailing the undue share of power held by New England in the Senate, the flagrant injustice of which can receive no alleviation, but only aggravation, by the increase of the whole population of the nation. The grievance can be redressed no otherwise than by an amendment of the Constitution.

If further proof be desired of disunionism in New England prior to the last war with England, or of her misconduct during that war, it may be found in Ingersoll's history of the war, and in Randall's life of Jefferson, Vol. 3.

